



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,139	12/05/2001	Ah Long Wong	49829.00008	4758

30256 7590 11/29/2006

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P
PATENT DEPARTMENT
ONE MARITIME PLAZA, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3492

EXAMINER

VIG, NARESH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,139

Applicant(s)

WONG, AH LONG

Examiner

Naresh Vig

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to response received 12 September 2006. Claims 1 – 24 are pending for examination. In the information received, applicant recites “Suntec City is a physical space in Singapore and began introducing tenants to each other in 1999. Suntec City did not have an intranet available to its tenants. Since 2001 Suntec City provided wireless broadband to users other than tenants”, and, “The tenant is provided space in either physical and/or logical space. Claim 1 does not limit it to either. As such, claim 1 should be interpreted as providing physical and/or logical space; Dependent claims limit space to physical space (e.g., claim 13). One of ordinary skill in the art can introduce tenants to each other as discussed above. Support is shown throughout the specification for these limitations as discussed above.

Response to Arguments

In view of response received from the applicant 12 September 2006, Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6, 14-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA.

Regarding claim 1. AAPA teaches:

providing space in a property to tenants;

gathering business information about tenants in the property (inherent that Suntec has to gather information about its tenants to be able to introduce tenants to each other);

introducing tenants to each other based on the gathered business information so that tenants may consummate business relationships (Suntec City began introducing tenants to each other in 1999)

Regarding claim 14, AAPA teaches

means for providing space in a property to tenants (inherent, Suntec City leases space to its tenants);

means for gathering business information about tenants in the property (inherent that Suntec has to gather information about its tenants to be able to introduce tenants to each other);

means for introducing tenants to each other based on the gathered business information so that tenants may consummate business relationships (inherent, Suntec City began introducing tenants to each other in 1999).

Regarding claims 2 and 15, it is inherent that AAPA teaches capability for negotiating for non-exclusive business relationships with vendors to supply tenants with similar services (Applicant is claiming a leasing condition as their claimed invention).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, it is inherent that AAPA teaches capability for negotiating for non-exclusive business relationships with vendors to supply tenants with similar products (Applicant is claiming a leasing condition as their claimed invention).

Regarding claims 6 and 19, it is inherent that AAPA teaches capability to handle business information which includes tenants' needs, product offerings, and service offerings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 – 5 and 17 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA in view of “Bartering For Space” by Matthew Weinstock hereinafter known as Weinstock.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 17 and 18, AAPA does not explicitly teach receiving services or equity from at least one tenant as at least a portion of consideration for providing space to the at least one tenant (bartering services in lieu of rent for space). However, it is old and known to one of ordinary skill in the art that services are provided in lieu or rent. For example, building managers are provided spaces, live-in help for an elderly etc. Weinstock teaches idea of bartering for space.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by Weinstock and receive services from at least one tenant as at least a portion of consideration for providing space to reduce obligation of business expenses.

Art Unit: 3629

Claims 7 – 8 and 20 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA in view of an article “Innovations” by Jerusalem Post labeled as Intranet For Apartment Dwellers hereinafter known as JerusalemPost.

Regarding claims 7 and 20, AAPA does not explicitly teach providing an intranet portal accessible to tenants for tenants to communicate with each other. However, JerusalemPost teaches concept of Intranet for apartment dwellers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by JerusalemPost so that a complex can have its own more convenient ways to interact and conduct business.

Regarding claims 8 and 21, AAPA does not explicitly teach providing a virtual mall for tenants to sell products and services both online. However, JerusalemPost teaches concept of Intranet for apartment dwellers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by JerusalemPost so that a complex can have its own more convenient ways to interact and conduct business.

Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA in view of an article "Discount Cards Are More Than A Marketing Tactic" by Michele Ho hereinafter known as Ho.

Regarding claims 9 and 22, AAPA does not explicitly teach providing a loyalty card program so that merchant tenants can track customer purchases and reward customers based on amount of purchases. However, Ho teaches the idea that business are using loyalty card programs to track consumer behavior and develop a better understanding of who their customers are.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by Ho to track consumer behavior and develop a better understanding of who their customers are.

Claims 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA in view of a Press Release "Hatching Tech Companies" by Maya Alleruzzo hereinafter known as Alleruzzo

Regarding claims 10 and 23, AAPA does not explicitly teach providing a start up incubator to tenants. However, Alleruzzo teaches idea of providing a start up incubator to tenants.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by Alleruzzo to take equity stakes in their tenants.

Claims 11 – 13 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art as acknowledged in response received 12 September 2006 hereinafter known as AAPA in view of an article "Work From Virtual Office? Why Not" by Christian Berg hereinafter known as Berg.

Regarding claims 11 and 24, AAPA does not explicitly teach providing at least one virtual office to at least one tenant. However, Berg teaches idea of virtual office.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA as taught by Berg to help a tenant minimize overhead of running a business. For example, business like MailBox etc. rents their address to businesses wherein tenants do not have physical presence in MailBox etc. facility.

Regarding claim 12, as responded to earlier in response to claim 11, AAPA in view of Berg teaches idea wherein space includes at least one virtual office.

Regarding claim 13, as responded to earlier in response to claim 11, AAPA in view of Berg teaches idea wherein space includes a physical portion of the property.

Conclusion

Applicant is required under 37 CFR '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is (571) 272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 6:00 (Wednesday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Naresh Vig", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Naresh Vig
Examiner
Art Unit 3629

November 27, 2006